

methods have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP §802.01 and §806.06).” However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has not provided reasons and/or examples to support this conclusion. Further, the Office has failed to show that the proposed methods are materially different from each other. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Applicants also respectfully traverse on the grounds that the Office has not shown that a burden exists in searching the entire application.

Further, MPEP §803 states as follows:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on its merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Applicants submit that a search of all claims would not constitute a serious burden on the Office. The lack of a burden is further evidence by the fact that this application has been previously examined where Claims 21, 22, 25, and 42-44 were presented in the same application (see Office Action mailed October 23, 2005). Pending Claims 42-44 are merely of a narrower scope than the corresponding claims that were examined together with Claims 21, 22 and 25 in the Office Action mailed October 23, 2005. Since these claims have *already* been fully examined on the merits, no burden can be reasonably found at this point.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,552

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)